

(LVII.) LETTER OF REV. J. E. ADAMS, CHAIRMAN OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
AND CORRESPONDING SECRETARY FOR MISSION, TO REV. A. J. BROWN, D.D.

Taiku, Chosen,

January 13, 1917

James E. Adams

My dear Dr. Brown:

I am in receipt of your favor of the 5<sup>th</sup> ult., relative to the adoption of the Hojin for the Seoul College. I do not know that I have anything to say on the particular subject. When a thing is done, it is done. There is nothing to do but face forward. I will only say that I think I feel somewhat like Hannibal after the battle of Metaurus, when the head of Hasdrubal was laid before him. Gazing upon it he sadly exclaimed: "O, Carthage, I see thy fate." With the head school of the Northern Methodists, the Pai Chai, a secularized school holding its religious work in a separate building off of the official school premises; with the head school of the Southern Methodists being forced out along an identical line; with the widely heralded Union College established directly by our own Board and these two and applying for a permit under the full application of the secularizing sections of the ordinance, the future of Christian education here is written with sufficient clearness. No ground is left for us with our other schools, and hiding our heads in the sand will not stay the storm. Your other educators will begin to set their course now; for it will be no ten years until they are either conformed or out.

There are one or two things in your letter of which I think perhaps I should speak, as there seems to be some misapprehension with regard to them.

1. Your expectation of a reply from those to whom you wrote. I sympathize very thoroughly with what seems to me to be the strain of dissatisfaction that runs through your letter to me, and your disposition to lay the blame of any possible mistake upon them. And yet one must be just. Your letter to Dr. North said that the Board felt it highly inexpedient and unfair to take final action without securing the judgment of the Educational Senate and the Federal Council, and did not take action. Your covering letter had but two sentences in it, one to the effect that you enclosed for their information your letter of that date in behalf of the Board to Dr. North; the other that any official information to the bodies mentioned would come from Dr. North, but it seemed desirable that these should know the position of our Board. No request or intimation of a desire for a judgment of the subject appears in the covering letter.

While I think that you cannot very greatly blame the men, I can, and I have no excuse to make for them. We talked it over and I urged them to write, after it became clear that the letters were intended as personal ones. They, in substance, said that the Board, having determined upon the institution, even though it had to be established outside of the Mission, they did not feel responsibility for it; their whole experience in relation to the matter did not lead them to think that anything they might say would be given great weight; and last, and most, they were thoroughly wearied of the subject, and had no desire to be parties to it again. I still urged them, pointing out what it meant to the whole educational work of the country, until finally they promised to write. I suppose they were unable to unburden their minds of their reluctance and put off the matter until it was too late. I sympathize with you in the matter.

2. Your expectation of some direct action of the Mission. The whole question, you know, is one that has a history, on the side of the Mission as well as of the Board. With all due respect for my good friend Dr. Speer, when he was here he took the position of the ideal bureaucrat. That is, the question of the establishment of the College in Seoul was a past one; it was settled; it was no longer open to consideration; it had been decided and it would remain so. Consistently throughout all his stay in all the committee conferences he refused to open it even for consideration, or to listen to anything on the subject. Finally, nothing was left to the Mission but to take action to the effect that if the Board was settled to follow this course regardless of its field organization and over its head, we must request it to do it without us - independent of the Mission - and directly. This course it decided to take.

Now if, as your letter states, the Board was reluctant to address an enquiry directly to the Mission on the question in hand, how much more (put yourself in our place) would not the Mission be reluctant to offer an unsought judgment on the matter. Yet, as a matter of fact, the Mission was so concerned that in every way open to it, outside of a direct "butting in," it went out of its way to make plain to the Board its position in the

matter. The Severance Medical and Chairyung Academy actions dragged the matter in by the ears and offered ample light as to the Mission's opinion.

3. Your anxiety concerning the difficulty and embarrassment of handling matters of this sort apart from the regular field organization. Your remarks would seem to indicate that you feel that the onus of this is upon the Mission. Surely, Doctor, in view of the well known history of the whole matter, you would not lay upon the Mission responsibility for the establishment of the institution upon any basis whatsoever. The Mission's position has been single and consistent from the beginning with a unanimity of seven to one. The conviction of the Board was such that it established the institution over the head of the Mission, against its protest, and, respecting the equal honesty of the convictions of its missionaries, finally has gone so far as to do this independently and outside of its own Mission. It is the Board which must bear the responsibility of the policy's outworking. And it is yourself, Doctor, I say it with all deference and respect, it is yourself as Secretary of this field in its organization, who must carry the individual responsibility. There is nowhere else to place it.

It is not simply a question of difficulty and embarrassment. It is not a possible way of doing work. Every year will accentuate the situation. The major question was not, is not, will never be, who was wise in their judgment on the original question. It may have been either; it may have been neither. The real point is that, as between a home Board and its field organization, Christian brethren working together, given all the circumstances as they were, for the former to have forced its ideas in a field question of a new undertaking was wrong, only wrong - the bitter fruit of which will grow and increase in every line of the service year by year. There the institution stands in our midst, a constant memorial of the Board's handling of the Mission in field matters. The present instance of these men not having written and the Mission not having taken action and the possible results that may have flowed from it, destructive of all Christian educational work in this country - the consideration of this gives you anxiety, and well it may. It gives more than that to me; for it is but a small illustration of the multitudinous increasing, disastrous impossibility of such a course. But one thing is necessary among good Christian men for the accomplishment of spiritual ends in service; that is a mutual cordial cooperating trust and confidence in common service. It is the sine qua non. That lacking all else avails nothing and loses its value. The present policy eliminates the one thing needful; eliminates it by Board decision. Observe, Doctor, that other Boards than ours have been up against the same problem in Korea, and though they believed their Missions were mistaken, as yet they have too much practical spiritual wisdom to take this course.

I would not venture to write you in this free way, with all reserve down, in an official capacity. This letter is purely private and personal. It is the misfortune of a man who tries to stand between and work something spiritually worth while out of a bad situation, that his own position must be more or less misunderstood by both. I trust that you will take nothing I have said as having any spirit of animosity in it. I sympathize wholly with the tone of anxiety and dissatisfaction that seems to run through your letter to me. It is with a sad heart that I write myself. Indeed, with us all out here the time of feeling, when we may have said and done wrong and hasty things, has long since past. There remains only a sort of weariness of spirit as we contemplate the inevitable spiritual failure and damage to the King that lies along the future of this policy.

However, it is made, and being made we will face forward. There is still much work to be done and we are brethren.

Believe me, affectionately,

Your fellow Servant,  
James E. Adams

*(from bound copy entitled PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp.131-133.*

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

(LVIII.)  
New York, New York

LETTER OF A.J.B. TO J.E.A.  
January 15, 1917

Arthur Judson Brown

The Rev. James E. Adams, D.D., Taiku, Chosen (Korea)

My dear Dr. Adams:

O have not written to the Mission about the action of the Board on the Chosen Christian College at Seoul, in view of the fact that at the annual meeting in 1915 the Mission asked the Board to deal with the College independently of the Mission and in view also of the fact that it made no reference to the Hojin [Incorporation] in the minutes of its last annual meeting, and thus strengthened the impression that it prefers to have the College question handled without relation to the Mission. And yet, as I stated in a recent letter to you, the interests of the College so dovetail into and affect the general missionary situation in Chosen that it is difficult if not impossible to deal with it as a separate matter, and the attempt to do so will be injurious to the Mission and its work, depriving the Mission of a voice in matters which concern it and in which it ought to be heard. Now that the College is to go on and the Hojin has been approved, subject to the explanations and interpretations that were stated in the Board's action, the question arises as to what course should be pursued by those who are troubled about the matter. You will recall my letter of December 5<sup>th</sup> to you, copies of which were sent to Mr. Reiner and Dr. Avison as the other men on the field whose letters on the subject were received before the Board acted. I now write a supplementary letter, not officially as a Secretary but only individually, to make some explanations which I wish most heartily that I could make orally in a personal conference. I would like to sit down with the missionaries on the field and talk the matter over at length. But as I cannot do that, I must write, although I keenly feel the difficulty of conveying just the right intention in typewritten statements which must be read ten thousand miles away. I feel this all the more anxiously because my letter of June 23<sup>rd</sup>, which I thought was so carefully phrased as to be perfectly intelligible, appears to have been misunderstood by the Presbyterian members of the Educational Senate and the Field Board of Managers to whom it was addressed.

I sent you a copy of the Board's action with my letter of December 5<sup>th</sup>. I now wish to indicate the considerations which influenced the majority to vote for it. The substance of these considerations is given in the action, but I will emphasize some of these points and add one or two others.

First: We have been trying for more than a year and a half to cooperate with the missionaries in the effort to persuade the authorities to make essential modifications in the regulations which require the separation of education and religion in mission schools, and you will doubtless recall my letter of June 16<sup>th</sup>, 1915, to Mr. Komatsu which you and many others on the field warmly approved. Now it so happened that the effort to secure some modification of these regulations that will enable us to continue our work centered in the Hojin of the Seoul College. This was not so much of design as of chronological coincidence. It appears clear that the Japanese officials so regarded the negotiations for the Hojin and that they considered its final form as their answer to the protests and representations that we so urgently made. Although some here feel that the answer does not go far enough to be satisfactory, it is evident that the Japanese feel that they have made large concessions. The majority of the Board's members and officers believe that these concessions are so substantial and are offered in such a spirit that it would be highly unwise to reject them and run the risk of having the law enforced in such a way at the close of the ten-year period of grace as to shut us up to the alternative of complying with a strict observance of it or closing our schools, as we had to in the case of the Girls' School at Syen Chyun.

Second: The Board was influenced by the reports of the considerable number of recent visitors to Chosen of conversations with Mr. Komatsu and other high Japanese authorities in Seoul, which appeared to indicate that the personal attitude of these officials is more friendly to missionary work than the cold text of the published regulations might suggest, that if the Boards would not press the matter in such a way as to put the Japanese on the defensive and make it possible for them to yield without losing face, we would have little, if any, trouble, and that the larger and wider interests of the cause of Christ in Chosen urgently call for the College in Seoul. I can imagine what some of you will think about this, but you will understand how natural it was that members of the Board should be influenced by such reports.

Third: We must take into consideration the fact that the missionary interests no longer present a united front on the question. The authorities are fully aware that a large and influential number of missionaries in Chosen, including the bulk of the Methodist missionaries led by Bishop Harris and some of the prominent members of our own Mission, are opposed to making further protest; and the Japanese also know that certain members and officers of the Mission Boards at home take the same position. Our ranks have, therefore, been hopelessly broken. In such circumstances it is futile to expect that we can get any more now than the Hojin offers, and there is fear that, if we reject it, we may get less.

Fourth: The Japanese are in absolute and permanent control of Chosen. All the conditions of the modern world point to an era of stricter national supervision not only in Chosen but everywhere else. We are having trouble with it in several other fields. The European War has revived a waning spirit of nationalism and we must reckon upon its power for many years to come. Now the question is: Can we work under this national spirit, especially in a country like Chosen where military and political conditions render the Government extremely sensitive and where strictness is deemed imperative as a national policy.

Fifth: A further grave consideration is that the Japanese suspect the loyalty of a large part of the American missionary body in Chosen and that this unsympathetic element is believed to be the one which favors the Pyeng Yang College and opposes the Seoul College. You and I have discussed this question before. I think I understand the Mission's views; but, as I stated in the Board letter of February 7, 1916, the question now is not so much what we think as what the Japanese think. They do not like the idea of having the children of their subjects educated by foreigners; but if the children are to be so educated, they want the foreigners to be those of whose attitude they feel most sure. If the Mission interests are going to have a higher educational institution at all, the Japanese would far rather have it in Seoul, and they will probably do for a mission college there what they might not do for one in Pyeng Yang.

Sixth: The Board feels that it is a great thing to have gained the Government's official recognition of the principle that a Mission institution must be manned and controlled exclusively by Christians who believe in the doctrines and principles of the Bible and that no one else shall be permitted to teach in it or to sit in its board of management. This is deemed an enormous gain. It is true that nobody has proposed to put in anti-Christian managers or professors; but it is also true that in some mission institutions there are non-Christian teachers and that there would be danger that, in a country like Chosen where the Government regards education as a state function, the authorities might at any time insist that a professor in a certain department was not satisfactory and should be replaced by a more satisfactory man, when perhaps a suitably qualified Christian could not be found. It is no small thing to have the permanent principle imbedded in the bedrock of a legal document that non-Christians can have no voice whatever in this Mission college.

Seventh: Another consideration which had large influence was the tender memory of Dr. Underwood's recent illness and death. Everyone knows that the Seoul College was the object of his toils and longings and prayers during the later years of his life; that he was its projector, its founder and its first president; that he secured the \$75,000 gold for the Presbyterian share of the property, and that he literally wore himself out and shattered his health in trying to carry the project through. His death near New York and his funeral in the city made a profound impression; and when the family pastor, in the discussion of the Hojin in the Board, dwelt upon this phase of the subject you will readily understand how difficult opposition became. Those who did oppose were frank and earnest; but the atmosphere was not favorable to their views. I must add, in justice to Mr. John Underwood, who was present, that from the beginning he had never taken advantage of his membership in the Board to influence this matter in the slightest degree. He keenly felt the delicacy of his position. Sometimes he absented himself from the meetings of the Chosen Committee when the question was to be considered. When he was present, he almost invariably sat in silence, as he also sat in the sessions of the Board, taking no part in the discussion except when some question was addressed particularly to him; and he expressed no small vexation when his name was mentioned as one of those who might financially support the college, insisting that he wanted the question decided on its merits wholly apart from any personal relationship to himself or his possible gifts.

Eighth: The argument was used, as I intimated in my former letter to you, that the Mission made no protest against the adoption of the Hojin, although it was given ample opportunity to do so, the Board having waited a long time in order to afford it opportunity to express any judgment that it cared to send. Nor did the

letters of the individual missionaries who were heard from indicate any clear consensus of opinion, nearly one-half favoring the Hojin. The point was made, too, that the Mission had approved the Hojin of the Severance Medical College, which covered substantially the same ground. It is true that the Mission stated that a medical college is in a different category; but it did not object to the Hojin for the college, and it was argued that the two cases were not so essentially different after all as our object in conducting a medical college is to provide Christian physicians and therefore reasons for having religion in it differ only in degree and not in kind. There were some here who favored the establishment of the college in Seoul, who did not believe that the absence of Mission action disapproving the Hojin should be used as an argument in support of the Seoul College because they were convinced that one reason why the Mission did not take action was because it desired to be as fair as possible and not appear to be exercising authority with regard to the College when the principle had already been established at the Mission meeting a year ago that the College should be independent of the Mission.

You may say that I am piling up ex parte arguments in support of the Board's action. Frankly, I am. And yet I would not have you think that the other side has been ignored. At the meeting June 22<sup>nd</sup>, when the motion was made to adopt the Hojin and it looked as if the majority would pass it I opposed it and went so far as to insist as the Secretary for Chosen that action should not be taken until the Missionaries on the field had been given an opportunity to express their mind; but I intimated that if, after such opportunity had been afforded them, they did not object, I would acquiesce. I was given my way in the matter, and in spite of pressure for early action, I was chiefly responsible for holding up the matter five months and a half until the minutes of the annual meeting arrived, when I found that they were silent on the subject. In laying the whole question before the Board, I sent copies of the full correspondence to all the members in advance, including the lengthy letters of objection from yourself, Mr. Reiner and Mr. Erdman; and the three alternatives which I submitted to the Board included one to decline to proceed with the College and gave a rather full summary of the arguments for this position. This summary was read in the discussion in the Board meeting. Four members earnestly elaborated and emphasized the arguments and a fifth wrote to the same effect.

But the odds were too great. The conviction that the cause of Christ requires a Christian College in Seoul, the center of Chosen's life; that the Japanese prefer to have it there and will befriend it as they will not befriend it elsewhere; the doubt whether a college in Pyeng Yang will be permitted to live after the ten year period of grace unless it wholly eliminates religion; the Board's unwillingness to commit itself to principles, by rejecting the Hojin, which might destroy all the educational work of the Mission, including Pyeng Yang, eight years hence; the avowed determination of the Government General to control all educational institutions on the ground that education is the function of the state and not of the church so that we must educate under the Japanese rule of Chosen, the fact that we should work in harmony with them if we possibly can; the belief that the refusal of their offer in the Hojin, after all the negotiations which preceded it and in view of the Japanese feeling that they were offering real concessions in a friendly spirit, would jeopardize our relations with them and make things worse for all the other Mission work in Chosen; the fact that the desire of other Boards to proceed makes a College in Chosen a certainty anyway and that we ought not to stand aloof in opposition to it; the strong recommendation of a College for Seoul and its Hojin by practically all the students of Missions from America who have visited Chosen during the last five years, a consensus of opinion which had great [weight] and which was reinforced by the opinion of prominent missionaries; the persistent and wide-spread impression that Pyeng Yang does not offer the most favorable auspices for the College which should powerfully influence Korean thought and life for the new era in Chosen; the grief over the death of the honored and beloved Dr. Underwood; the belief that his death was hastened by his efforts to establish the College and that the respect for his memory forbade killing it; the offer of \$75,000 gold for our share of property and equipment from those who loved Dr. Underwood - these and other considerations made a combination too formidable to be overcome, place yourselves in imagination in the position of the members of the Board, and you will understand how natural it was for the majority to feel that, although the Hojin did not give all that they would like and although there were grounds for misgivings, nevertheless approval seemed to be the most practicable thing to do in view of all the circumstances.

And now word comes from Dr. North, Chairman of the Joint Committee of the Boards having work in Chosen, that the four other Boards in the United States and Canada have approved the Hojin, so that all five of the Boards in North America are in line; although for other reasons one or two do not see their way clear to

1/15/1917 - p.4 A.J.B.

pledge definite financial support at present.

Since therefore the College in Seoul is a fact decided upon after the fullest and most deliberate consideration, is it not wise for all concerned to turn in and make the best possible out of the result? Grant that it was unfortunate that our negotiations with the Government regarding the regulations separating education and religion happened to turn on the Hojin of the Seoul College and that we would have chosen different ground if we could. Grant too that some of the considerations are rather extraneous to the question whether the interests of the cause of Christ really require a college in Seoul under present conditions; nevertheless these extraneous influences exist and the majority of the Board feel that it is impossible to leave them out of sight - since things have turned out in this way, is not a policy of Christian acquiescence better than a continued antagonism which would simply perpetuate strife and grievously injure the Cause of Christ? It would be lamentable if this institution, destined to be so conspicuous and influential, should by the opposition of missionaries be driven out of touch with the dominant Christian influence in Chosen. As we are to have the institution, why not try to make it as helpful as possible to the common interest?

I am sending copies of this letter to Mr. Reiner and Dr. Avison for the same reason that I sent them copies of my letter of December 5<sup>th</sup> to you - namely, that they are the missionaries on the field who wrote to me on the subject. I also send a copy to Mr. Sharp from whom I heard shortly after the Board acted. My thought in writing is to try to make clear why the majority here believed that the Hojin should be adopted and why some of those who had serious misgivings deemed acquiescence the most practicable course in view of all the circumstances.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Brown

*(from bound copy entitled PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp.133-136.*

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

Pyongyang, Korea

March 5, 1917

William M. Baird

My Dear Dr. Brown:-

I have too long delayed to write you in appreciation of your personal letter, and of the resolutions which you prepared and which were passed by the Board concerning the death of Mrs. Baird [June 9<sup>th</sup>, 1916]. You could not have been more considerate or appreciative. Only those who have passed through such deep waters as I know how to be truly thankful for Christian fellowship and helpfulness. I do thank you with all my heart for your personal words and for the resolutions, and for all that you have done in connection with this sad event.

It is now something over three years since Mrs. Baird first went to America, and while there at that time she tried to secure benefit at Baltimore from Dr. Kelly. We had strong hopes that she was cured, but it was not to be. Our high hopes were quickly followed by disappointment, God has sustained me from day to day, and I have done my work during the fall and winter in this station and in Chairyung.

Of course I am unspeakably lonely. But I would not bring her back if I could. She has passed beyond sorrow and suffering, and for her it is better to be there. And for myself, I shall look forward and onward and upward. God is good, and I can trust Him, do trust Him will trust Him. I shall rejoice in Him and keep busy. With such a God as we have the Christian should always be victorious.

At present I am planning to leave here on my furlough about July 12<sup>th</sup> just after the Annual Meeting. My address in America after September 1<sup>st</sup> will probably be Wooster, Ohio.

You have probably already heard from others that during January in Pyeng Yang over two thousand persons professed a desire to become believers in Christ. This was in connection with all the churches as the result of cooperative evangelistic services.

On July 6<sup>th</sup> you wrote me that you had written again to Dr. Yocum, asking for an explanation, and enclosing a part of my letter. I have waited with interest to learn whether he answered, and to know what he said. In case he answered I should like to know his reply. In the event of his not having answered satisfactorily, I find myself wondering how I ought to meet him in Wooster. Certainly it will be hard to treat him as a straight man. Yet I presume there is nothing additional that may be done. I am

Yours Very Sincerely,

W.M. Baird

WMB/FP

(from the microfilm records of the Board of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Reel #4, Series II, Record Group 140-3-13, letter #14)

(LIX.)  
Taiku, Chosen, (Korea)

J.E.A. TO A.J.B.  
March 19, 1917

James E. Adams

Dr. A.J. Brown, D.D., Fifth Ave., New York City

Dear Dr. Brown:

I have been long since in receipt of your letter of January 15, 1917, and must beg your pardon for not having given an early reply. I have delayed not because of lack of consideration but because I have thought that it required much consideration, and I have been somewhat at a loss as to what position to take and what reply to make. For it seems clear that your letter, while presumably written simply to set forth the reasons which determined the Board in its purpose there, yet set these forth with a view to the question whether with the situation so determined, it was not the proper course for these who had been opposed to the establishment of the institution, to now exercise what you term "Christian acquiescence" and unite in the operation of the institution. Such a proposition of course calls for serious and careful consideration.

Probably my letter of January 13, 1917, which you would have received later, led you to think that I would not be inclined to consider such a proposition. I am however quite willing to consider anything. The suggestion you make however, while no subject for criticism in a private and personal letter, seems to me a quite improper one to emanate from the Board to the Mission, in view of the historical working out of the problem. There was a distinct agreement between the Board and the Mission as to the basis on which the institution was to be founded if the Board insisted on founding it. On this basis the Mission ceased its objections, and the Board saw fit to go ahead. Now that it is an accomplished fact, and accomplished in a way that has put a knife into the heart of Christian education for the future Church of Christ in the land, to apply pressure for "Christian acquiescence" would not be a proper course to pursue. If problems and difficulties and manifest injuries thicken, they raise but one question, which is, whether you have not adopted a mistaken course and should correct it.

I trust that you will believe, Doctor, that I appreciate and sympathize with the thickening difficulties of your position as Secretary of the Board for this field in this matter. As I said in my former letter it is not a possible situation. I doubt not that as you look into the future of it you are anxious and troubled. What responsible servant of Christ would not be! You will forgive my saying, as this also is a private letter, that for the last year or more my own interpretation of your letters has been, that personally you would have been relieved to have been able to find grounds for withdrawing entirely from it. Your love for your fellow laborers on the field; your recognition of their moral if not legal rights in field questions; your appreciation that the Lord's work is done "not by power nor by might, but by my Spirit"; your increasing realization of the difficulties and even disasters besetting the path proposed, doubtless have all combined in leading you to this position. But as you say in your letter. "The odds were too great."

The reasons you set forth for the Board's action have been of especial interest to me and have strongly confirmed me in a position which I have been approaching for some time. Some as you say are "ex parte", but all have some application to the matter in hand. You will note, however, that almost all carry their weight or hold their argument, in some supposed condition or hypothetical possibility on the field. Who may in reason be supposed to be best acquainted with field conditions and possibilities? Members of the Board, passing travelers of a day, or the men who have been up against these conditions and parties, in intimate contact with the parties from the beginning? Now at least eight-tenths of your Mission, carrying a half of all the work there is in the country, and with two-thirds of all the older missionaries on the field, will laugh at those reasons. They know that they are not true - they do not exist - their only value is in home consumption. Some of them are such what shall I say - I do not wish to offend; I do not wish to be disrespectful; I know you do not give them as your own - but many of them are such piffle, that the most ardent advocate of the institution has never ventured to produce them for inspection here on the field.

This simply brings me to what is the real object of my letter. The College question is a settled one. No one purposes to revive it. In itself it has never been more than a local question. I may also say frankly that I do not think that the Board has exceeded in any way the authority delegated it by the Assembly for the conduct of its foreign missions. Indeed it would be difficult for the Board to do this for the simple reason that it has delegated to it all the authority this side the horizon, and has been made correspondingly responsible. Authority must go with responsibility, and when questions arise, responsibility must decide. The fault is not with the Board, but the

system. It is an outgrown system.

Since the time when the Assembly appointed the Board and charged it with the duty of organizing and superintending the work of disseminating the Gospel in unevangelized lands, so far as I am aware no further definition or differentiation of authority has been made. It has been left where it was then, placed exclusively in the hands of the Board. The field missions as operating organizations carrying responsibility and therefore to be endowed with corresponding authority, hold no recognized place in the organized operations of the Church and Assembly. They are simply the creatures of the Board. It is, let us say, a benevolent imperialism; benevolent, or at least with the best intentions of being so, but imperialistic, if for what it considers sufficient reasons it wishes to be, down to the most minute detail of field operation.

This was probably necessary and proper in earlier days; but it is outgrown. The field work has grown to too large dimensions; it has become differentiated and complex; it differs in every Mission; the native peoples are assuming their place in the family of nations and an intimate acquaintance with their social life and psychology is more necessary to wise operation than ever before; the Missions themselves have grown to be large well organized bodies of experienced workers; they are trusted with the expenditure of millions of dollars a year; moreover, as the operating field organizations of the home church, established by the General Assembly, including hundreds of its presbyters, they have moral and spiritual rights in the determining of their field policies and the molding of the product which is the fruit of their life's labor. On the other hand all men are finite. Even those with the best of intentions and to whom the highest honor is to be accorded, particularly is this true in judging a matter with which one has little or no personal acquaintance. It is no disrespect to say that this is true even of Board members, Board secretaries, and passing visitors of renown. The perils of the present system, increasing with the growth and complexity of the work, are not only the perils but the certainties of an absentee imperialism. And lastly; we are Presbyterians; born, bred, and broken to harness in a system of representative democracy expressing itself in graded courts with responsibilities and authority, and with their rights correspondingly distributed. As Presbyterians we believe that wisdom in initial jurisdiction is in the main best conserved by locating such jurisdiction in the superior body most immediately concerned; and that it is this body that in general has the strongest claim to divine guidance for wise decision in such matters. The average Mission has a larger permanent voting body in it, all carefully selected by the Board when commissioned, than the average Presbytery in the home church, and its membership is far more permanent. Four per cent of all the Presbyters of the home church are in its Foreign Missions, yet the present arrangement provides no place of recognition of their service in the organization of the great purpose of the Church save that of simple employees.

As I said this is no criticism of the Board. It is the criticism of an outgrown system which I trust the Board will help in seeking to rectify. Time has brought changes until a grave injustice is being done to a large body of the Assembly's agents and the church's Presbyters, and it constitutes a grave peril to the great work that is the Church's highest honor.

At this time when the whole question on the chapter of Missions is before the Church, being remodeled, it is eminently proper that this question also should be considered. The relation of Missions in the homeland to the immediate controlling body is a minor consideration because of the fact that it works within that body's boundaries, in a commonly known condition, with immediate superintendence, and is itself usually without organization and composed of but few individuals. The relation of foreign Missions as usually organized to its governing body in the homeland is a matter with such markedly distinct features as to raise the question whether it should not be embodied in the legal definitions of the church. As Presbyters of the church I think we are not going beyond our proper functions in seeking a discussion and consideration of the matter by such proper means and channels as may be to us. Believe me,

Yours in the Service,  
James E. Adams

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp.136 - 138.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

Pyeng Yang, Korea

April 9, 1917

Samuel H. Moffett and Lucia Moffett

Dear Grandma - [referring to Alice Moffett's mother]

Thank you ever so much for those pretty white shoes you sent for my birthday. I wore them all day and had such a good time looking at my feet. I had a baby walker given me, too, so now my feet will be on the floor and mother says I must wear shoes every day. Those will be my best and though they stay on nicely now they are long enough to fit me all summer. Next Saturday when we four boys are all at home we expect to have our pictures taken. You will see my new shoes and the cap, too.

Jamie and Charles gave me the nicest rubber rattle. It came in the Montgomery Ward order because they studied the catalogue and picked it out for me. Birthdays are lots of fun. They didn't tell father about my rattle but surprised both of us. It made him curious to see what they had and they almost burst with the fun of giving. They are nice boys. They give me the best romps. I know them both. When father says "Jamie", I look right at Jamie. When he says "Charles", I look at him. Of course I do. The boys say, "Where's grandma?" to me sometimes. I don't quite know where to look then.

Goodbye now, with love from

Samlet

per mother

Dear Aunt Mattie, and Mother - [Aunt Mattie to Lucia and Mother-in-law to S.A.M.]

Sammie forgot to say that his first bite was taken on one of the arrowroot biscuits on March 31<sup>st</sup>. It was an event. He liked the biting but did not quite know what to do with the crumbs, trying to spit them out. The boys are learning a good deal and are so interested in each development.

Poor Jamie, you know, gets absorbed in one thing to the exclusion of everything else. Today he intended to come straight home to practice but an errand took him to the baseball field and piff! away went all thought of the piano. He says "How can you make yourself remember when you just can't? I told him to put a list of things where he would see them or keep a little book in his pocket for a while. "But how could you remember to look at the book?" He will learn but most of us can sympathize.

These days we are constantly being led blindfold to some spot in the garden, then told to open and look at a green spot in the lawn, a violet plant or - today - a whole branch of green leaves.

Charles told me to tell you he got 100 in arithmetic today, then called out after getting into bed that he had something else to say tomorrow morning.

Yesterday was Easter. Under Miss Crane's direction the boys carried ferns to church and

4/09/1917 - p.2 S.H.M & L.M.

decorated it nicely. Each room sang an Easter hymn for us, too. Charles was happy in his new pongee suit made with a coat like the white suit you sent Jamie. It was made from a long cloak of his mother's and is almost the last goods of hers, I think, that can be used for the boys. There are buttons, though, that can be used over and over.

The Engels with their two little children fill the guest house but when Mr. Bowles, of the *Society of Friends* in Tokyo and representative of the Peace Movement, wrote about coming to Pyeng Yang, Sam thought for the children's sake we should invite him here and double up a bit.

Seminary is keeping the men busy. No one thinks of any news except from Washington and the front. All Dr. Baird's three boys will be taken by the new military training law.

With love from us all and hoping that Mrs. Lumison is back helping the domestic machinery to run smoothly.

Lovingly,

Lucia

P.S. They have put me on the Bible Training Class Committee this year! And I scarcely know what the classes are.

(from the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers)

(LX.)

Taiku, Chosen

LETTER OF J.E.A. TO A.J.B.

April 16, 1917

James E. Adams

Rev. A.J. Brown, D.D., 156 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, New York City

My Dear Dr. Brown:

Your favor of March 7<sup>th</sup>, came to hand some time ago. As we have both not infrequently said, it is very difficult to put a thing onto paper, send it half way round the world, and have the other party take off just exactly what we intended should be put on. It is easy to say things without offense or misinterpretation, that are very difficult to write without both. So I trust that whatever I have written you will try to interpret in the light of the very real respect and affection which the long years of our fellowship in the service has given me for yourself. My own letter of March 19 which you have doubtless since received, will, I think, help you somewhat in this line. I beg that you will not for an instant question it.

I do not doubt that all you say with regard to the difficulties of the situation are true, and doubtless you could have said much more. I also do not doubt that what you say with regard to positions and statements from the field is true. Some men make unfortunate statements most of the time and most men make them some of the time. That is to be expected and it is not peculiar to the foreign field, nor can wise policies be built on such alienations. In justice, however, it should be put over against this that these statements were stirred to life by a course which the Board inaugurated, and a priori probability would lead an impartial investigator to look for the root of the whole difficulty quite as much in the cause as in the effect. My own belief is, speaking in the large, that that is where it lies.

The theory on which Mission administration has run in our work has always been recognized as one - all ultimate authority resting with the Board. In practical operation, however, this has not been the case. But for some years now it has been recognized by the older missionaries in most of our fields - at least I can speak for many in the China Missions, the Japan Mission, and our own - that there has been a well marked tendency toward concentrating the exercise of authority in the Home Board. It covers the whole of field policies and field operations. If for reasons which appear sufficient to the Board its judgment is otherwise, it does not recognize the propriety of the field being determinative in such matters. A year ago last Summer I took my vacation in Karia Zawa [Japan]. In conversation with a member of our Mission there, I happened to mention the petition for a definition of relations which the Korea Mission had proposed to present to the Board. He inquired earnestly with regard to it, and then said, "How I wish you had mentioned it before our Annual Meeting. Our Mission would have been one with you on it."

Last year I happened to fall in accidentally for a half day's travel with an old and prominent member of one of our China Missions who was passing through. He raised the question of the difficulties the Korea Mission has been having along this line; then himself spoke of the tendency I have mentioned, and said that they had recognized it in their China work and its recognition was one of the strong underlying causes of the formation of the China Council.

If I were asked to put my finger on the root of the present difficulty I should say that, whereas with the growth of the field work in extent and complexity, and with an increase of the workers in numbers, experience and organization, the natural and proper sequence would be an increased committing of responsibility and authority to the field, the actual sequence with the passage of time has been the exact opposite. If I were asked the underlying cause I would say that it was a well meant misapplication of the modern movement toward union. Dr. Goucher in his address before the Conference for the Promotion of Unity in Foreign Missions voiced it well. He said, "No great manufacturing, commercial or financial institution would commit the determining of its policies to its various departments. No general would expect a successful campaign if he left its planning to his separate corps of commanders. An organism with more than one head is abnormal, and without a head it is a fit subject

for burial." True! But who is the head of this Business? A Board? Evidently he counts Christ out of the reckoning. Christ is an autocrat. But He will give no such place to any among his people or in His service. He reserves that to Himself alone, and primarily operates direct with those whom He calls and places. It is the recognition of this that is the glory and abiding power of Presbyterianism.

Speaking with full recognition of the concessions and modifications of the principle necessary in order to efficient organization, it is this which the concentration mentioned violates. And with the increasing complexities of field operation, and the increasing completeness of field organization, the incongruity of it is becoming an impossibility. It is ceasing to be a question as to whether the field organization is willing to stand it and becoming a question as to whether it can. For you will readily acknowledge that the foreign missionary is not simply a Board employee. That is but a minor aspect of his calling. He believes, whether rightly or wrongly, that Christ calls him and places him and that primarily he works under his orders direct, and (again recognizing necessary concessions for necessary organization) in general he must follow His orders as it is given him to understand his orders. Therefore, under the process mentioned of the concentration of all real authority in a body on the other side of the world, the acquaintance of whose members with actual conditions is almost wholly a matter of hearsay (I beg you will not take offense at the expression) there may easily come a time when the field body can go no further. Loyalty to Christ at whose call they have come; loyalty to His service, as it is given them to see its needs; for which they have already given their lives, their ambitions and their loved ones; direct personal responsibility to Him all alike made it impossible.

A large experienced field body with practical unanimity, judge a certain new proposition vitally affecting the whole field service, to be not for the best interests of their work. The home body goes ahead and inaugurates it on the field outside of and independent of the field body. The field body submits. Time passes. New conditions arise. The field body goes out of its way to say that it believes that no such step on the field as a certain designated one should be taken under present conditions. The home body takes the step, and the thing is done - done for all time and for everything in the field - for the whole future of Christ's Church in the country. What are the field workers to do? To whom and to what degree are they responsible for the Lord's work in that field? It is not a question of whether I love you or you love me. We do love each other. But I have a stewardship to Christ in this field. Every missionary here has, and he cannot surrender it to the Board. He holds it to Christ alone. Some proper recognition of this must be granted and its exercise conserved. In the nature of the service and our several relations to the Head, the field has the same right to some check upon the Board that the Board has to a check on the field. The welfare of the service requires that each should check the judgment of the other.

I think I may say without the fear of your even wishing to contradict me, for you too are His servant and carrying a stewardship from Him, that a system that makes possible such a situation to arise, has somewhere in it a radical defect. The larger the work grows, the more complex, technical, and pressing its problems, the more certain does it mean continued failure. The field body cannot consent to it. The home body ought not. For it relates to the good of the service. No consideration of unfortunate alienating statements on one side, or (pardon the suggestion) of unwise action on the other, should be permitted to stand in the way. Personalities have no place. It is a question of adjusting our system so that each of the several parties engaged have assigned and conserved to them that degree of responsibility and authority which accords with the admitted stewardship of each. It is only equity and righteousness, those fundamentals without the careful guarding of which by all concerned, no enterprise has the blessing of God, and without the cordial mutual granting of which, self respecting men who follow Christ cannot cooperate.

I doubt not that the situation weighs heavily upon your mind and heart and that you say it is important that you be kept informed as to developments. I almost hesitate to speak lest my motives for doing so should be misconstrued. And indeed I have little information except that of rumor and reported statements. But there is no question but that the sober-minded dissatisfaction is widespread and deep, and that many are considering whether they can remain in the service. Many are debating their duty of

4/16/1917 - p.3 J.E.A.

making an adjustment through agitation in the home church and their Presbyteries. I myself have written to a church paper and communicated with my Presbytery. But - when numbers start that, those unfortunate alienating statements of which you speak are bound to appear, and then the fat is in the fire, and the damage to the service at large through injuring the Church's confidence in the Board no one can measure. Doubtless all are hoping that some adjustment can be made. It is my own hope and I believe that it should and can be done.

Believe me, with most affectionate regards,

Yours in the Blessed Service,

James E. Adams

*(from bound copy entitled PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp.138 - 141.*

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

Pyongyang, Korea

Spring, 1917

William M. Baird

I hesitate exceedingly to speak on this subject because where friends differ in opinion it is easier to keep silence. But I believe that a proposal which causes so much division of opinion as the suggested amendment may well wait a while for final decision. Its effect may be different from what its advocates think it will be.

The discussion, so far as I have seen it, has largely centered about only one phase of the question, viz., the relation between the Home Board and the Presbyteries in America. Those Presbyteries fear that their constitutional rights will be invaded by the Home Board and their power of initiative will be destroyed if this amendment passes. They are undoubtedly right, but the objection applies with even greater force to the effects of the plan upon foreign mission administration.

It is evident that the amendment seeks for the Boards as the General Assembly's agents additional authority to "initiate, direct and control" all mission operations and its originators do not like the action of the General Assembly of 1914 which again gave that power to the Presbyteries. In matters of mission administration differences of opinion have arisen on the question of jurisdiction. Boards desire absolute and final power. Presbyteries and Missions desire some autonomy in their field operations and policies. Presbyteries have always been supposed to have this autonomy constitutionally. But Missions have grown up that are larger and more fully organized than almost any Presbytery and yet constitutionally they are nonentities depending for their being on the good will of the Board. Now it is proposed to give the Boards still more authority. In preparing to give to the Boards a constitutional place and function let the General Assembly take pains not to do so at the expense of the rights and usefulness of the missions and the missionaries.

The missions have absolutely no direct voice in the General Assembly. They may claim no vote nor voice in the Board except by courtesy or on invitation. Missionaries often question the wisdom and justice even of the present working plan. They have reason to fear the proposed one still more. It is at the expense of the missionary's fundamental rights as a Presbyter, and at the expense of the widest usefulness as a Christian worker. More than that the missionaries modestly but firmly believe that the matured judgment of a successful mission, which is on the ground, and knows the conditions, is undoubtedly worth more than that of those who are called "mission experts" situated at half the globe's distance away. They modestly but firmly believe that the mission expert is the man on the field doing the work. It is not merely a theoretical question of rights. Although rights are dear, and it has often been considered the duty and burden of our Presbyterian ancestors to stand for them, yet this is more than a question of rights. It is a question of how to achieve the greatest usefulness. Of all men the missionaries are the most vitally interested. They have invested their lives, past and future, in the enterprise. Their all is at stake. It is due to some extent to their efforts that there is any mission or any mission work in their field. To have no voice, or only a minor voice, in the determination of policies which they consider essential to the success or failure of their life's work is asking more of them than is asked of any equal number of coordinate Presbyters in any other part of the world. The Home Presbyters and Presbyteries would not bear it for an instant. Home Presbyteries, synods and the press would all speak out until they compelled a hearing. The foreign missionary as such has no direct voice in the General Assembly, and very little in either home Presbyteries or Synods or in the Home press. Unless his Foreign Board represents his sentiments correctly he has no representation anywhere. Should the Mission differ from the Board the missionary becomes a man without any hearing. At times he feels both expatriated and almost unchurched.

Let us face the facts. The Foreign Board by this amendment would be clothed with all power in mission work and the foreign missionary would become merely the Board's hired man, without voice in the management of concerns which are doubtless more vital to him than to any other human being. The

General Assembly by constitution has the power of "superintending the concerns of the whole church." This is as it should be because it is a representative body and all voices are supposed to have a hearing there. But unfortunately the foreign missions and the foreign missionary is not represented there directly. Now it is asked by this amendment to give all the powers of the Assembly handling mission work to the Board. The missionary would then be further deprived of his rights and have his opportunities of usefulness further curtailed by being placed as a mere employee under a Board, a body of men in whose deliberations and decisions he could claim no part and no representation. Shades of Knox and Melville! Is there anything else like it in all Presbyterian history? Three hundred and seventy-four ministers with their associates (1331 in all at present) reduced from Presbyters to employees! Episcopacy and Archbishop Laud could ask for nothing better.

Not to speak of other missionaries, the clerical missionaries alone lack only seventy-seven men of being as many as those who in 1843 formed the great Free Church of Scotland. Or to use another comparison, the clerical missionary force in service on the foreign field is equal to the total number of ministers (with and without charges and including the foreign missionaries sent from those states) of the states of Indiana and Kentucky, with enough left over to form an extra Presbytery of eight ministers. What would the ministers in these states and Presbyteries think of having the initiation, direction and control of their working policies decided for them by a Board located in London or in Korea?

Of course I do not intimate that it is the Board's intention to be despotic, or that the advocates of the measure suppose that the effects will be contrary to Presbyterian precedent. They doubtless hope to add to their efficiency. But they see the matter only from one side. Naturally the Missions' interests are seen best by the missionaries themselves. Only discussion and conference by all persons interested can bring out the whole truth.

My friend Dr. Stevenson in his article, "The Mission Amendment" in *The Presbyterian*, refers to certain times in the past history of our church (1791) when certain Presbyteries or Synods asked the Assembly for "leave in the matter of sending missionaries to destitute places within their own bounds." But as the editor well replies this was at a time of meekness in the early days when things were done which would not be practical at this time of fuller development. "No Presbytery today would overture the General Assembly to manage its own missionary concerns." Similarly what was true in the early days of foreign mission work is no longer true and the policies then employed have now become palpably unjust. The system needs to be changed not in the direction of a more rigid oversight but of less oversight toward a wise autonomy, especially in those missions which are large and capable of conducting the work as well or better than the faraway Boards. One effect of the proposed plan would be to give to the Home Board the same power over the home churches and Presbyteries that the foreign Board now exercises over the foreign missions, and it will do for both the foreign and the home Boards what has never been done before, viz., make the exercise of this power constitutional. It would leave neither Presbyteries nor missions any constitutional ground of complaint. The object is to render legal and constitutional the powers which the Foreign Board has been exercising and to authorize the Home Board to exercise some of the same kinds of power the Foreign Board has been tacitly exercising.

It is said. "Restlessness under board direction and control is not peculiar to the home field. Missions under the Foreign Board when they approach the desired stage of self-government begin to petition for the right of initiation, direction and control in the administration of funds."

"The Foreign Board cannot permit the missions or the missionary Presbyteries to override its judgment as to what the will of the whole church is regarding missionary principles and methods, and the right use of benevolent funds."

Now without any reflection upon the unusually good men who are on the Boards I affirm without fear of successful contradiction that there are no men or set of men however good who are capable of being trusted with such arbitrary power. I also maintain the bureaucratic principle of church government is foreign to the Presbyterian system. It is not tolerated in the work in America and is equally intolerable in the foreign mission propaganda. No man or set of men, however saintly, can permanently be willing

to yield up, not only their liberties, but the whole direction of their lives and the policies which direct and make useful their life work to the control of a Bureau. Missionaries necessarily surrender many things for the supreme end of being able to preach Jesus Christ to those who know him not. In loyalty to the Master they are perhaps as willing as any class of men to suffer and to surrender rights. But the very loyalty which leads them to be willing to do so also makes them utterly unwilling to surrender what they regard as vital principles. More dear to us even than the principles of "no taxation without representation," the "parity of the ministry," and "no episcopacy in Presbyterianism," etc., is the liberty to follow conscience in the use of mission methods. No body of men, half the earth's distance away, and dominated perhaps by entirely different theories of mission work, are capable of dictating what should be done, what policies are best. It is neither good for them spiritually to have such power nor is it right nor just to the missionaries that they should have it.

If the General Assembly expects to get the most efficient service out of its agents on the foreign field it should not use methods which will deprive them of their self-respect and of their initiative power for offensive service. A self respecting, efficient, eagerly cooperating field force is just as essential to the enterprise as a powerful directing center. Self respecting men will not abide under the proposed conditions. They become intolerable. There are limits beyond which even missionary loyalty will not drive men. Their loyalty is to the Master, not to Boards, and should the proposed system go into effect it could not but result in driving some of the most efficient men out of the foreign mission work as well as in destroying work already favorably started. Rather than pass the present proposed amendment let some one propose to give the missions more autonomy and to give them direct representation in the General Assembly. Of course all right thinking missionaries cheerfully recognize that in the administrative affairs the Board must necessarily exercise a certain superintendence over the mission affairs, especially in the carrying out of policies which have been already settled by the General Assembly and on which the church has a fixed policy. But the tendency of the times, and the lessons we learn from history, point not toward autocracy and excessive centralization, but rather in the opposite direction of the more specialized and more efficient cooperation of many autonomous units not working under coercion but in hearty partnership. When we see still further steps taken to place not only the final decisions but even the initiative of mission work into the Board's hands, and that without making exception in favor of those regions where the missions are sufficiently well organized to be abundantly capable of deciding their own policies, it is evident that the system will reduce the missions to be the merest nonentities and will inaugurate into our church a great bureaucracy for which we have no precedent nor parallel, and whose effects can not but be essentially disastrous.

*(from bound copy entitled PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp.141 - 143.*

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

## A Foreign Missionary's Point of View, By Rev. James E. Adams, D.D.

Taiku, Korea

Spring, 1917

James E. Adams

The widespread discussion in church papers of the proposed revision of Chapter XVIII has carried greater interest to none than to the church's foreign missionaries working under the General Assembly. The causes for revision arose in the home church. So the discussion has wholly centered around conditions obtaining in the home church. The revision proposed, however, covers all missions, whether of the home or of the foreign field. In view of this, it seems remarkable to Presbyters in the foreign missions of the church that the discussion has so confined itself; also both revision and discussion have limited themselves wholly to defining the mutual relations of the controlling bodies, and their authority in relation to the missions, while nothing is provided and nothing said with regard to the missions' relations to the controlling bodies. It would seem to be chapter on "Missions" with the Missions left out.

The reason for this of course is easy to understand. The discussion originated through a lack of definition between the controlling bodies in the home land, and the solution of this has occupied the minds of those bodies. The question of a mission's functions – the definition of its responsibilities, authority and rights – in relation to its controlling body, is for the ordinary mission in the home land, a matter of extremely minor importance. A single mission is not infrequently a single individual. It works within the boundaries of the controlling body; under conditions of common knowledge; with immediate superintendence, and where carried on by local bodies the agents themselves usually members of the controlling bodies, with full representation.

In the foreign [missions] every condition is the exact opposite. The controlling body is a single one, the General Assembly or its home agent. The work is at a vast distance, under diverse, complex, and often rather incomprehensible conditions. The mission is usually a large, well organized, operating body, necessarily to a degree administrative, with membership carefully selected, and when once entered involves a life work. As the field work increases in magnitude and complexity, proper distribution and clarity of definition, as regards responsibility and authority in field administration becomes increasingly vital to wise and progressive operation. In a chapter on "Missions" therefore, what is a very minor matter in home missions becomes an extremely major one in our great foreign work. So much so that as relates to the Church's foreign work, it is Missions with the missions left out.

Since the time when the Assembly organized the Foreign Board, and charged it with the duty of organizing and superintending the work of disseminating the Gospel in unevangelized lands, so far as I am aware, no further definition or differentiation of authority has been made. It has been left where it was then placed, as under the Assembly, exclusively in the hands of the Board. The missions as operating administrative field organizations, carrying responsibility, and therefore to be entrusted with corresponding authority, hold no defined place in the organized operations of the church as represented in the Assembly. They are simply the creatures of the Board. It is, let us say, a benevolent imperialism; benevolent of course, but imperialistic (if for what it considers sufficient reasons the Board so desires) down to the minutest detail of field operation.

This was probably necessary and proper in earlier days, but it is outgrown. The field work has grown to too large dimensions. It has become differentiated and complex. It is different in every mission. The native peoples are taking their place out in the world, and an intimate acquaintance with their social life and psychology is more necessary to wise administration than ever before. The missions themselves have grown to be large well organized bodies of experienced workers. They are trusted with the expenditure of millions of dollars a year. Moreover as the operating field organizations of the home church, established by the General Assembly, including hundreds of its Presbyters, they have moral and spiritual rights in the determining of their field policies and the molding of the product which is the

fruitage of their lives' labors.

On the other hand, all men are finite, even those of the best of intentions, and to whom the highest honor is to be accorded. Particularly is this true in matters where one has little or no personal acquaintance. It is no disrespect to say that this is true even of Board members, Board Secretaries and passing visitors of repute. The perils of the present system are not only the perils, but the occasional certainties of an absentee imperialism. And lastly, as much as our fellow Presbyters in the home church, we are Presbyterians, born, bred, and broken to the harness, in a system of representative democracy expressing itself in graded bodies, each carrying its proper authority and responsibility, and with those rights definitely conserved. As Presbyterians we believe that wisdom in initial jurisdiction is in the long run best conserved by locating such jurisdiction in the body most immediately concerned. We believe that in the long run it is this body that has the clearest claim for Divine guidance in such immediate matters. The average foreign mission of the Assembly has a larger permanent voting body in it, all carefully selected before commissioned, than the average Presbytery in the home church. Its membership is far more permanent. Four percent of all the Presbyters of our church are laboring in them. Yet the present arrangement provides no recognition, makes no place for their service, in the church's organization of its "supreme work," save that of simple employees.

This is in no sense a criticism of the Board. The Board commands the honor of all who know its work. It is a criticism of an outgrown system. Time has brought changes until an injustice is being done to a large body of the Assembly's agents and the church's Presbyters, and the situation constitutes a very real peril to the great work that is the church's highest honor.

At this time when the whole question of the Chapter on Missions is before the church for remodeling, it is eminently proper that this question also should be considered. The relation of missions in the home land to the governing body is indeed a minor consideration, but the relation of a foreign mission, as usually organized, to its governing body in the home land, is a matter of such markedly distinct features, as to raise the question as to whether it should not be embodied in the legal definitions of the church.

If I might be allowed to offer a suggestion I would point out that what the revision lacks is a separate section dealing with the "Mission." All other related bodies have their section, and I would suggest a revising to make that section read somewhat as follows:

"Missions as ordinarily organized in foreign lands are the agents of the Assembly for the propagation of the Gospel and the planting of the Church. They have the supervision of the Assembly's work within their bounds, and by the power of review or control are subject to the Assembly or its authorized agents. They may be represented in the Assembly by a delegate."

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp.141 - 143.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

(LXV)

MINUTES 1917 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Section 18 – Recommend that the Petition to the Board of Foreign Missions for consideration and clearer definition of Board and Mission Relations presented to the 1915 annual meeting (page 73) be taken from the table.

Section 19 – Recommend the following as a substitute for the above referred to Petition:

1. That we request the Board to secure a revision of the Manual so as to provide that:

Missions as ordinarily organized in foreign lands shall be the agents of the General Assembly for the propagation of the Gospel and the planting of the Church: the Missions to have the direction of the Assembly's work within their bounds; and, by the power of review and control to be subject to its Board or other authorized agent. The Missions are also to have the right to appoint Commissioners to the Assembly.

2. That we communicate the above action to the other Missions of our Board asking them to unite with us in this request.

*(from bound copy entitled PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, p.149.*

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

Pyongyang, Chosen

July, 1917

S.A. Moffett, Chairman  
Board of Directors, Union Christian College

The Rev. Allen F. DeCamp  
Editor, *Korea Mission Field*  
Seoul, Korea

Dear Mr. DeCamp:

I am sending you herewith a copy of an appeal for a Memorial to the late Dr. Graham Lee. The plan for a Memorial has been under consideration in Pyeng Yang Station for several months but no concrete plan for action had been worked out until the Board of Directors of the Union Christian College recently suggested the desirability of raising an Endowment for the College and naming it "The Graham Lee Memorial Fund." It is fitting that such a great man as Dr. Lee should have a lasting and impressive Memorial raised to his memory in the place of his labors.

Regarding Dr. Lee, Frederick Palmer, the great war correspondent, while on a visit to Korea said, "I would rather be Graham Lee and be doing what he is doing than to be any other man I ever knew." And that is the feeling which must actuate every other individual who learns of the marvellous influence he exerted throughout the great revival of 1907. He, more than any other single man, was the soul of that revival. God used him to begin that work, but in His Providence, Dr. Graham Lee has been called away from the grand work he so excellently began, to a higher and better service.

While the accompanying "Appeal"\* is designed primarily for friends of Dr. Lee in the homeland, the Board of Directors believe that everyone who knew him in Korea, whether missionary, member of the Korean church, visitor, or acquaintance, will want a share in this Memorial. Several missionary friends have already responded to the call and a fund of approximately 10,000 yen has been subscribed.

The Board of Directors has no desire of adding an additional burden to the load the missionaries are carrying, but knowing how deep is the love many bore Dr. Lee, we wish to give everyone an opportunity, at least, to share in the Memorial. In proportion as we on the field show an interest in this matter may we expect consideration from friends at home. We would suggest, therefore, that anyone who so desires make whatever contribution he wishes personally and, furthermore, we would suggest that those who care to do so, agree to try to raise some specified sum for the cause, and forward the same to the Treasurer of the Committee on Endowment.

We ask that you unite with us both in prayer for this object and in the effort we are making to bring this matter before friends.

Your co-operation will be greatly appreciated.

Yours in His Service,  
Samuel A. Moffett, Chairman  
W.D. Reynolds  
G. Engel  
James E. Adams  
R.O. Reiner, Secretary and Treasurer,  
Committee on Endowment.

\*The Appeal is for \$100,000.00  
(from the October, 1917 issue of *The Korea Mission Field*, pp. 265, 266)

OFFICE OF CHAIRMAN

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
OF THE  
KOREA MISSION  
OF THE  
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U S A

Pyongyang, Korea

July 9, 1917

Samuel A. Moffett

Dear Dr. Brown:

I transmit the following actions of the Mission as they ought to be before you as soon as possible and before you examine the Minutes of the Annual Meeting.

Sec. 11, and Sec. 12 of the Ex. Com. Recommendations to the Mission were adopted as follows:-

"Recommend that in regard to the matter of the temporary assignment of Rev. Wallace J. Anderson to Japan for language study and the Board's enquiry in letter No. 324 as to the opinion of the Executive Committee in regard to the proposal, the Mission reply that in its opinion a fair mastery of the Korean language before beginning the study of Japanese is to the ultimate advantage of a missionary to the Korean people." In accordance with the above action we therefore request the Board to send Mr. Anderson direct to Korea.

There was no difference of opinion in the Mission on this. We also had a strong letter from Dr. Tipton of Chungju who could not be at the meeting, giving reasons why Dr. Galbreath and others for Korea should be sent direct to Korea and not to Japan even for study of Japanese language

Sec. 19 and 20 were adopted as follows:-

"Recommend that the 'Petition to the Board of Foreign Missions for Consideration and clearer definition of Board and Mission Relations' presented to the 1915 Annual Meeting (page 78) be taken from the table. Recommend the following as a substitute for the above referred-to Petition:

1. That we request the Board to secure a revision of the Manual so as to provide that Missions as ordinarily organized in foreign lands shall be the agents of the General Assembly for the propagation of the Gospel and the planting of the Church: the Missions to have the direction of the Assembly's work within their bounds; and, by the power of review and control to be subject to its Board or other authorized agent. The Missions are also to have the right to appoint Commissioners to the Assembly.
2. That we communicate the above action to the other Missions of our Board asking them to unite with us in this request.

In the Educational Committee's report there was a section for which the following was adopted as a substitute:-

"In answer to the request of Seoul Station for the Registration of the John D. Wells School and the Women's Academy in view of certain conferences held with government officials as to the interpretation of the Educational Ordinance, we would reply:-

1. That we express our appreciation of the attitude of the officials in their interpretation of the Revised Educational Ordinance regarding religious instruction in school buildings outside of school hours for we believe it indicates a desire and willingness on the part of the officials to meet the convictions of those engaged in missionary work in so far as they are able to interpret the Ordinance so as to interfere least with the purposes of the missionary bodies.

7/9/1917 - p.2 S.A.M.

2. We gratefully recognize the fact that under the present conditions we are allowed the privilege of giving religious instruction in our schools and we recommend that we avail ourselves of the provision which allows this and that we seek to ascertain whether the government can not eventually find some way by which such relief may be afforded as will enable us to continue our schools with this same privilege.

3. That we represent to the Board the necessity of greatly enlarged appropriations for our schools if we are to meet the desires of the Government as to their equipment and teachers and that we make inquiry of the Board as to whether it can provide the necessary amounts.

4. That we commend the efforts of those in charge of our schools to make the curriculum correspond to that of the Government schools of the same years and grades and so far as possible to meet the Government request that instruction be given in the Japanese language."

I send this because it shows the Mission position as to registration under the present ordinance. It was adopted after a long discussion of all the principles and conditions involved.

In accordance with Mission action I also sent a cable to Mr. David L. Soltau of Tacoma, Washington, as follows:-

"Soltau, Tacoma, College need urgent, Mission requests you, Moffett."

It is believed that this will bring him to the field and as we hear that you have already found his credentials satisfactory we hope soon to hear of his appointment., This will fill Mr. Smith's place in the College.

I have received the Estimates from the Fiscal Committee and a copy of the Minutes from the Secretary and will send by registered mail.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

Samuel A. Moffett  
Temporary Chairman Ex. Com.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
OF THE  
KOREA MISSION  
OF THE  
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A

OFFICE OF CHAIRMAN

Pyongyang, Korea

July 13, 1917

Samuel A. Moffett

Rev. A.J. Brown, D.D.  
156 Fifth Ave., New York City

Dear Dr. Brown:

I am preparing to send you Mss. copy of the Minutes of Annual Meeting, and according to rule am calling your attention to matters which call for Board action. Some of the most urgent I mentioned in previous letters and others such as requests for Appropriations, New Property, New Workers. Furloughs, etc., I will leave until the printed minutes are ready for mailing to you, as they will be much better for reference.

1. Executive Com. Report, Item No. 152, Medical Com. Report, Item No. II, and Fiscal Com. Report, Item No. 1 all deal with the question of the provision of an extra ¥1000 for the Pyongyang Union Hospital in place of endowment, this to be provided annually in addition to the present regular appropriations to the Chosen Mission. Please notice that this must be specifically designated as for the Hospital as an extra or otherwise the Fiscal Com. tells me it will go to other objects which the Mission has given claim upon any increase in the appropriations for next year. I quote only the item from the Medical Com's report as follows:-

"Since the Board in New York has indicated to the Mission that it is not prepared to grant the ¥25,000 requested for the Hospital (Pyongyang Union) but would prefer to make an extra grant of ¥1000 per year we ask the Mission to request this amount as a preferred item, putting it in Column D of the Estimate Sheet."

2. Exec. Com. Recommendation No. 152. (5) adopted by Mission should be formally approved by the Board. It is "That union work be commenced as soon as final Board approval to the Basis of Union is secured."

3. Executive Com. recommendation No. 151 should be acted upon by the Board at once. It is: "That Andong Station sell outlying pieces of property bought with station site money but which events prove are not now needed for the site and with the proceeds purchase other pieces of property which are needed for the completion of the site."

4. Medical Com. report, Items VIII, X, and Xii dealing with request for War emergency appropriation of ¥1000 for drugs; with Dr. Galbreath's assignment and with question of his language study in Japan. On X and X11 Dr. Avison has written you.

5. Evangelistic Com's report Item 11, (1), (2), (3) dealing with the joint Station in Manchuria with the Scotch Mission. Please read the long report on this question in the Exec. Com. report.

6. Property Com's Report, Item 12, - Permission for Seoul Station to sell some property inside the South Gate and use the proceeds to purchase other needed land in connection with our present holdings in the Station. This is an old Korean house years ago occupied by an evangelist and not used for years.

7. Educational Com's Report. Item No. 14, as follows:- "The Mission calls the attention of the Board to the fact that if the Mission Academies are to be conducted so as to compare favorably with the Government Schools, it will be necessary to make considerable expenditures for buildings and equipment and to increase the annual budget for the seven Academies by ¥13,000 to ¥20,000. The Mission asks the judgment of the Board as to how far such an increase would be wise and possible."

8. Apportionment Com's report, Items 15, 16, and 19 dealing with request for funds for Dr. Baird in connection with his assignment to Literary Work, and the request that the Board authorize Dr. Baird to raise these funds while in America. Dr. Baird left for furlough last week.

Also Item No. 19 requesting that the Board in case it should find itself unable to appoint a man to the Union Christian College at Pyengyang at once to allow the Mission \$2000 this year for the employment of other teachers in the College.

I trust that these urgent requests will not seem too formidable and that notwithstanding war conditions the work may be provided for. We appreciate all that is being done for us and the strenuous efforts you put forth but in a growing work the needs must increase and we must put those needs before you.

Asking God's blessing upon you and the Board in the consideration of these needs and with kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

Temporary Chairman Executive Committee

I enclose also medical certificate re Dr. R.K. Smith.

Copy of the estimates was mailed you today and Mr. Bernheisel, the Recording Secretary, tells me he has sent mss. copy of Minutes in part and will send the rest.

Seoul, Korea

August 13, 1917

Oliver R. Avison

Rev. E.H. Miller  
163 Pasadena St.  
Pomona, Calif., U.S.A.

Dear Mr. Miller:-

Yours of June 30<sup>th</sup> came to hand in due time and we were glad to get definite news of your condition, your doings and your future plans. You wrote your letter just while Annual Meeting was in session at Pyeng Yang. Instead of giving you a long statement of the occurrences I will enclose in this copies of letters which I wrote Dr. Brown after the meeting which dealt with several of the subjects that occupied the attention of the members.

It will not be remembered as a meeting when great advances were made or great accomplishments were registered - it was mainly remarkable for the long discussions on several topics when the same arguments were reiterated not once but many times not only by different speakers but by the same speakers who were not satisfied to express themselves once or twice in practically the same terms in an endeavor to force their views on the minds of their brethren and sisters.

One of the remarkable (perhaps not "remarkable: in its ordinary meaning but rather perhaps "noticeable") features that was developed was the hold that Mr. [R.O.] Reiner has gotten on the Pyeng Yang people in the control of the P.Y. Academy and College and the extent to which he has compelled them to change their ideals and bring them more nearly into harmony with those of Seoul. One example of this is shown in the leaflet which Mr. Reiner on behalf of the P.Y. College Board has published in regard to the *Graham Lee Memorial Endowment* for the College.

This has probably reached you ere this and you have probably noticed the statement that the policy of the College is now not to exclude all non-Christians. You may remember that this is one of the points they fought the Seoul College proposition on and it was largely due to letters written by Mr. Sharp and Dr. Baird maintaining the policy of exclusion of all non-Christians from our educational institutions that our Board finally decided (see their letter of Nov. 1914) to locate the College in Seoul.

During the debate on the report of the Educational Committee on the request of Seoul Station, which was brought in by Mr. Reiner, he stated that the report carried with it the idea that in continuing the negotiations set going by Mr. Koons with the government officials concerning registration of Kwangsin and Chungsin schools, the mission would ultimately register its schools under the new ordinances. Dr. Moffett in answer to this brought in a resolution which practically said we would not register until the end of the period of grace in 1925, and supported it with such an eloquence of reference to God's will having been just now revealed to him after a period of two years of indecision, of the removal from his heart of the heavy weight he had been carrying as a result of his inability to decide on the right course, of the joy he now felt in being able to see his duty clearly though the following of it should result in the closing of all our schools, of the necessity that was upon us to stand unflinchingly for the maintenance of all the liberty that our ancestors had bled and died for, that his motion carried with scarcely a whisper of opposition. He then asked the privilege of holding the motion back for wording it in a way that would make it as little objectionable as possible to the authorities and this was granted him. In the afternoon and evening following, Mr. Reiner put his ultimatum in to Pyeng Yang Station saying he would resign from the College and School if they did not modify the resolution so as to keep it from meaning that they would not negotiate with a view to registration and he carried his point so that the sting was taken out of the resolution (see copy of amended resolution which I shall enclose). What then about

the afore-mentioned eloquence?

We are expecting Rhodes in Seoul in about 3 days more. I have telegraphed him at Yokohama to come to our home and this will give us an opportunity to talk things over.

I do not know what the status will be. He cabled the mission asking for appointment to Seoul College but of course they turned his request down with the reply that he is needed in Syen Chun, which to be sure was an evasive answer. The cable was sent in his name rather than in Dr. Brown's, he wrote me, because the Korean missionaries in New York, Adams, Sharrocks, Whittmore and others, suggested that the mission would probably receive it more favorably were that course followed. It is time for everybody to realize that those yet in control of the Mission Executive Committee will not favorably receive any proposition touching this College.

I have not heard what happened in New York after they received that answer - whether the Board simply accepted the Mission's action or whether they appointed Mr. Rhodes to the College as seems so desirable.

If they do not appoint him it is certainly up to the Board to give us someone for the College at once. I understand from a letter written me by Mr. Rhodes after his interview with Mr. John Underwood that Mr. Underwood told him that even though Mr. Rhodes should take your place this year he thought there would be no financial reason in the way of your coming as soon as you are ready. This is good news. I am sure Mr. Underwood will stand by the College as long as we earnestly push its interests.

I have heard that Mr. [Clarence] Weems has been appointed by the Southern Methodist Board to teach in the College for one year awaiting their appointment of a regular man. There is some possibility that Mr. Weems will be continued in evangelistic work and the Southern Methodists support for one year the Japanese professor of law that we are expecting to engage in time for the reopening of the College, the thought being that Mr. [Ernest] Fisher, who taught in the Philippines and in Japan and spent the past year in Dr. White's Bible School will spend this coming year at Columbia University in preparation for teaching in our College. I suppose this will all be decided at their coming conference and Mission meeting.

The staff now consists of -  
 Northern Methodist: Billings, Becker, [Oliver A.] Weller  
 Northern Presbyterian: Underwood  
 Southern Methodist: ?  
 Canadian Presbyterian: ?

The Canadians will have appointed Rev. L[uther L[isgar] Young as their representative on the Board of Managers and will give us a man on the faculty.

Other teachers are -  
 Messrs. Takai & Ichijima, a Japanese professor of Law & a Jap. teacher of Athletics; Paik Sang-Kyu, R. Lee, Mr. Pak - -, and other instructors including Mrs. Weller and Mrs. Becker. If we only had Rhodes we could make it go finely.

I am in correspondence with Hylton with a view to engaging him for the oversight of buildings and the giving of instruction in certain industrial lines and he will probably join us within two or three months. I have sent you a photo of a layout suggested by one architect and am now awaiting two other

8/13/1917 - p.3 O.R.A.

schemes, one by Mr. Voories of Japan and one by Mr. Hussey of the firm of Shattuck and Hussey, the Architects employed by the International Y.M.C.A. Committee for their buildings and also in charge of hospitals in Peking and Shanghai to cost \$2,000,000.00 each. Mr. Hussey was here a couple of weeks ago and I went over the grounds with him. He, like all the other architects, was most enthusiastic over the site and the prospects for a successful College.

I will later on send photos of the layouts proposed by the other architects. Probably if we get those three we shall have sufficient information on which to make plans for a satisfactory scheme of the whole.

We have been waiting for the Governor-General's return from Japan to complete the deal for the turning over of the government's part of the land. He was expected back Saturday (this is Monday) so we look for a speedy completion of this long pending matter. I am told it has received the approval of all the offices and now awaits his signature.

I note with pleasure all you say about Mrs. Miller's recovery. Mrs. Avison joins me in kindest regards to you both.

Sincerely,

O.R. Avison

(LXVI)

LETTER OF A.J.B. TO J.E.A.

New York, N.Y.

August 30, 1917

Arthur Judson Brown

The Rev. James E. Adams, D.D.,  
537 E. Wisconsin Ave.,  
Neenah, Wisconsin

My Dear Dr. Adams: -

I have run down to New York for a few days and I find your letter of the 27<sup>th</sup> inst. Such a conference as you propose would surely be exceedingly interesting. The trouble is that my colleagues and most of the members of the Board whose attendance would be desired are now away on their vacations and I have no means of knowing whether they could attend a conference at the time you mention, that is, between September 10 and 18. The only practicable day for me within the dates you mention would be Friday afternoon, the 14<sup>th</sup>. A number of vacation absences will expire next week and I will ask Mr. Scott to take up the matter with my colleagues on their return and to write you. What is your idea about the traveling expenses that would be involved? As the missionaries are somewhat scattered this would be a considerable item. The war conditions are affecting the Board very seriously and the receipts for the first six months of the fiscal year are only 60 percent of what they were for the corresponding period of last year. The Board therefore must be extraordinarily careful about additional expenditures. You will recall moreover that we have already had two conferences with furloughed members of the Mission, which were attended by a larger number of the Chosen missionaries than would probably be available now. What reason have you for supposing that a third conference would accomplish anything more than was accomplished by the two conferences already held?

I remain as ever,

Very cordially yours,

A.J. Brown

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, p.149.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

(LXVII)

LETTER OF J.E.A. TO A.J. B.

Neenah, Wisconsin

September 4, 1917

James E. Adams

My Dear Dr. Brown: -

Your favor of the 30<sup>th</sup> ult. is at hand. September 14<sup>th</sup> as date for the conference will be entirely convenient for myself, much better than later. Doubtless Mr. Whittemore will see whoever is in the office and talk the matter over as I wrote him asking him to do so. I will also write the other men concerning your letter.

As to the questions raised in your letter, I had not thought of the matter of expense. Nothing was said to me about it at the time of the June conference, and I met my expenses myself at that time. Without any particular thought I had assumed that I would have to do so this time. I do not think, however, that this need be a very large item, as Mr. Whittemore, Mr. Holdcroft, and Mr. Sharpe are all in New York State. And indeed I do not question but what if it were necessary they would be willing to meet their own expenses. Dr. Baird is at a greater distance.

Concerning the value of the conference and the prospect that it would accomplish more than the other two. The whole object of these conferences is to work out some mutually satisfactory adjustment between Board and Mission in the administration of field affairs. As yet nothing, even tentative, has been reached. But if there is the desire of both parties, it can be much more greatly facilitated by conference than by correspondence alone. As I said in my former letter suggesting it, it would be extremely difficult to get together a body of men, such as are now here, who are so intimately acquainted with the field side of the difficulty, and so representative of the mission's practically unanimous desires in the matter.

The former two conferences accomplished two things only. They made clear that it was the desire of both to arrive at some mutually satisfactory adjustment. They also agreed that on this basis it was the best mode of procedure for the mission to first formally make known its desires to the Board. This last is now done, the mission having formulated its desires in the matter, and for the first time the ground is now cleared for a conference of any definite and practical value.

Being here in the country and holding the official position in the mission that I do, with the other members of the mission Executive Committee here, and the action of the mission received, it has seemed to me the proper thing to suggest such a conference and the conference itself to be the natural and desirable conclusion of informal preliminary action.

Its object would be to definitely consider the points involved in the Mission's request.

The conference of course, is uncalled for if the Mission's request as it stands is entirely acceptable to yourselves in the Board. It will be valuable as there may be points in the request calling for explanation, discussion, or change. Believe me,

Yours in the Blessed Service,

James E. Adams

(from bound copy entitled *PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK*, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp.149, 150.

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)

(Apparently this was sent in the form of a letter to Dr. Arthur Judson Brown, of the Board of Foreign Missions, PCUSA, in New York)

### OUR POLICY IN KOREA

This year there was an evident tendency to develop work along lines of a very different policy from that which has characterized our work for many years - ever since Dr. Nevius' visit in 1890.

I believe the most important element in the successful development of our work, that which has given us a self-propagating, self-supporting Church, has been the Apostolic simplicity of the work and the holding in the foreground the Gospel character, the soul saving spiritual nature of the message of God to a lost world.

We have avoided the presentation of any other appeal based upon material, educational or philanthropic advantages and have concentrated our efforts upon bringing to bear upon the heathen people the supreme claims of the gospel which we believe to contain what God has ordained for the salvation of men. No institution has been allowed to stand before the people as an exponent of Christianity but Christianity itself. Christ (and His truth) has been presented to them so that this people have been made to feel that the Church is the institution which stands forth as the evident center and aim of the [faith we proclaim].

Medical and Educational work have been made secondary, as they should be. I believe thoroughly in both the Medical and Educational work and in their thorough development as first class work when the time for that development arrives, and I have been foremost in the mission in advocating thorough first class medical and educational work - but I insist with all the strength of deep conviction that that development must succeed - not precede the establishment of the Church. (This would not rule out preliminary medical work where needed to open the way - but applies to developed institutional work.)

Four years ago I believed that the time for advance in our educational work had arrived and for four years I have urged over and over again the establishment of thorough Academies in the two states, Seoul and Pyeng Yang where the Church has already provided a constituency, and I still urge the development of these Academies. This should be done to prevent the continued circulation of such erroneous and misleading statements. I am enclosing another article from the *Seoul Press* and ask your particular and official attention to it.

The Japanese Government has organized an Extraordinary Educational Conference and it may be that Provisionally this is the opportunity for which so many have been praying and that through this Conference influences may be brought to bear which will bring about a change in the attitude of the government so as to allow to private schools the right to teach the Bible in those schools.

How I do wish the Board had stood by the position taken by you in your letter to Mr. Komatsu and had not compromised on the question of the Bible in our schools. I am confident that had we stood together we should win that right before the ten years of grace are over, and I still have great hope that we may secure that right if the Mission steadily maintains its position and the Boards will help us.

In view of this Conference, is not now the time for the Boards and Missions and our own Diplomatic Officials to approach the Japanese Government asking that this Conference give

9/17 - p.2 S.A.M.

consideration to this question and meet the wishes of missionary bodies as to the right of religious instruction in our Mission Institutions? Of course if they think the Boards are satisfied with temporary interpretations which allow religious instruction outside of school hours and not in the school proper they will not grant more.

I do not think it is too late for our Board to make its influence felt to secure what the Mission is standing for.

Now, Dr. Brown, I do hope I have written nothing which in these days of strained relations and misunderstandings will be taken amiss. Until recently I have always felt free to write frankly and to express my convictions, believing that such freedom is conducive to the best interests of the work, but I confess to great hesitation about writing anything these days, since I know that some mistakes have been made in what has been written and the spirit in which they have been written has been misunderstood.

With kindest regards and earnest prayer that you may be guided in all that is done bearing upon the delicate problems of the work in Korea.

Very Sincerely,

Samuel A. Moffett

(from a photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Whether the original is in the collection of the Presbyterian Historical Society in Philadelphia is uncertain)

(article from the Seoul Press sent by Dr. S.A. Moffett of Pyongyang, Chosen, together with his letter of September 28, 1917 to Dr. A.J. Brown)

RELIGION AND EDUCATION IN CHOSEN

Mr. K. Usami

Director of Internal Affairs, Government General of Chosen

At a general meeting held on September 3 of the Presbyterian Mission lately in session in Seoul, Mr. K. Usami, Director of Internal Affairs of the Government-General of Chosen, delivered a noteworthy speech. We have been favoured with the draft of the address, from which we make the following translation:-

I am exceedingly glad to have been given an opportunity of meeting you here at this large assembly and privileged to lay before you my views concerning the Church.

It is nearly full seven years since the Government-General of Chosen was first established. During this interval the revision of the regulations controlling private schools and the institution of regulations concerning religious propagation, which the authorities enforced, caused at one time misgivings and doubts among those connected with the Christian Church and evoked some discussion. But the Government-General has never entertained the slightest idea of persecuting religion or of impeding its development and spread. Some five or six years ago I was present at a meeting held in the Severance Hospital of many missionaries and other people connected with Christian evangelization and spoke on the subject of religious work in Chosen. I stated on the occasion that in order to promote the happiness of the Korean people, both political and spiritual assurance must be given them, and that politics and religion must cooperate in order fully to attain the desired end. I had occasion to read a report on Chosen prepared by Dr. Speer, who visited the peninsula in 1915 when an exhibition was held in Seoul. I could not help being impressed by the clear and thorough understanding of conditions in Chosen, which the learned gentleman had obtained. In this report Dr. Speer says:

"The annexation of Chosen to Japan, bringing with it so many and so great blessings in the government and development of the country, has brought with it also, and quite naturally, new problems regarding the mission work, involving the adjustment of mission schools and religious propagandism to the regulations of the government on these subjects, corresponding in part to similar regulations in Japan. Such readjustments are not always easy but, approached in the right spirit on each side, they ought not to be too difficult and there is no reason whatever why they cannot be happily worked out in Chosen where the missions on their side have no aim but to teach the people a religion which makes men law-abiding and loyal and to promote the process of natural progress and racial unity, and where the government on its side welcomes the spread of true religion and is ready to give every liberty consistent with its aim of complete assimilation of the people. We are coming away from Chosen with full confidence in the good faith and high purpose of the forces which are working for the betterment of the land."

I may say that I heartily agree in the main in what Dr. Speer says in the above quotation. Even a casual study of the history of Japan and a consideration of the Constitution will convince you that religious liberty has been and is a principle adhered to by our Empire. The Government is always ready to welcome a religion which will make people good and loyal citizens and contribute to the progress of the nation.

The policy of the Government-General of Chosen is such as has just briefly been stated. I am highly pleased that along with the progress of time, this has been well understood by all connected with Christian missions and now little or no cry is heard on the subject. With regard to the separation of education from religion – a question most seriously discussed, the Government considers it highly

enclosed with S.A.M. letter of 9/28/1917 - p.2 K. Usami satisfactory that many mission schools have either decided or are prepared to reorganize themselves in conformity with the Government regulations. Last year an unpleasant affair occurred in a certain mission school. The principal of that school was of the opinion that in order to prevent recurrence of similar affairs it was imperative to reorganize the school so as to satisfy the Government requirements. A few of the missionaries belonging to the mission, however, did not share his view and the question was pending. It happened at this time that two ladies specially despatched from home on a tour of inspection paid a visit to Chosen. Taking opportunity of this a meeting was held concerning the question above referred to and the views of the two ladies were sought. It is understood that the two ladies expressed themselves unequivocally in favour of the reorganization of the school, saying that it was out of question that the school should be adapted to the Government regulations. The Korean young people, whom the schools belonging to their mission, intended to educate, were subjects of the Japanese Empire and not of the United States. Therefore, in their opinion, they must be educated in conformity with the educational policy of the Japanese Government and it was really distressing to think of the future of these young Koreans not so educated. The day following the meeting the two ladies called on me at the Government-General office and told me that the reorganization of the school was decided on at the meeting, but that it must first be approved by the Mission Board at home, which would meet in May. They also assured me that on their return home they would explain to the members of the Board conditions in Chosen and endeavour to carry through the decision. Some time after I was pleased to receive information from the two ladies that the Mission Board had specially met at the end of March and decided to approve the proposed reorganization of the school. They further informed me that all the other schools belonging to the mission would also be similarly reorganized. In this way the school in question was able to reorganize itself from the beginning of the new school term in April. Were all the Christian Missions in Chosen to take such a liberal attitude, the relations between the Government and the Church would become exceedingly good. As a matter of fact, I am glad to say, such happy relations are beginning to appear between them.

*(to be continued)*

(LXIX)

LETTER OF J.E.A. TO A.J.B.

Taiku, Chosen  
Rev. A.J. Brown, D.D., 156 5<sup>th</sup> Ave., New York City.

December 7, 1917

James E. Adams

My Dear Dr. Brown:

In my letter of the 26<sup>th</sup> ult. concerning the actions of the Executive Committee of the Mission at its meeting of November 7-20 you will remember of my saying that there were other matters of which I would write subsequently. There are a number of these, as that of the Rev. W.E. Smith, school deficits for the current year, etc., concerning which the data is still not sufficiently complete for me to take up. I am now at work upon them and will write you from time to time as I am able to get them in hand and present them. At this time I am writing concerning the adjustment in field administration as between Field and Home Base, of which the three conferences were held in New York last summer.

You will remember that at the last conference a suggestion was made concerning the drawing up of a Brief or statement on the question, and we were requested in view of all that had come out in the conference, to make a restatement which we thought would better embody the wishes of the Mission, and come closer to the ideas of the Board, as given expression at that time. This we did before I left and I was requested by the other men to bring it before the next meeting of the Executive Committee and get action from them upon it. I have only now had time to get copies of the Brief containing the action made, and so forward it to you at once. Will you please bring it before the Board for its further consideration of the matter.

The action of the Executive Committee on the subject was as follows:

Passed: That Dr. Adams' Brief on the definition of relations between the Mission and the Board be endorsed as a whole.

Passed: That the suggested amendment to the Manual as given in Article 6, Section C, of the Brief be approved.

Passed: That a copy of the Brief be sent to each Station.

Passed: That a copy of the Brief be sent to Dr. Brown requesting him to present it to the Executive Commission of the General Assembly in view of their having charge of the revision of Chapter XVIII of the Form of Government, with the suggestion that if they wish further information concerning the same that they can refer to Messrs. Sharpe and Holdcroft on furlough.

You will remember that at our last conference in New York you made some very strong statements as to what the Mission was attempting to do just before the meeting of General Assembly last Spring. Indeed you were so convinced by evidence you had in hand that you stated that you "knew" that it was an attempt on the part of the Mission to appeal to the Assembly against the Board without the Board's knowledge. Your statement was so strong that I presume that you are still unconvinced to the contrary. However the entire action of last Spring was directed not at all towards the Board but toward this proposed revision of Chapter XVIII with the purpose of holding it up. For to our minds it clenched the direct point under discussion, and by putting it in the Form of Government, settled it for all time. "Superintendence" is a very general term, which may include almost anything the superintendent wishes to put into it, "Direction," is explicit and inclusive.

While the revision was not passed, the various overtures concerning it were referred to the Executive Commission to reconstruct and bring in recommendations concerning [it] next year. At least so it was reported to the Mission by Mr. Whittemore, our representative to the Assembly last year. The matter therefore is still not entirely settled, and for this reason we wish the Executive Commission informed as to the bearing of the matter on the Foreign work, that it may be acquainted with this in formulating any recommendations to the next Assembly.

The Mission has, of course, direct representation in the Assembly and in view of this it did not seem improper to us to communicate directly on the matter with the Executive Commission, but, remembering the misunderstanding which arose concerning the second section of the Mission's action on

12/7/1917 - p.2 J.E.A.

this same matter at the last Annual Meeting and your strong beliefs concerning the character of the actions of last Spring, and being very desirous that no further cause for misunderstandings should arise, I was instructed to send the communication to you, with the request that you forward it to the Commission, and at the same time explain to you our reasons for doing this. Mr. Sharpe and Mr. Holdcroft were mentioned because both are now in America; and one is the former Chairman and the other a former member of our Executive Committee; and either of them can well represent the Mission's ideas on the matter. One is our delegate and the other his alternate to the next General Assembly.

With most cordial regards,

Yours in the Blessed Service,

James E. Adams

Corresponding Secretary and Chairman of Executive Committee

*(from bound copy entitled PRESENTATION OF DIFFICULTIES which have arisen in the CHOSEN [KOREA] MISSION of the PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S.A. because of a Lack of Definition between the Foreign Board and itself concerning their mutual responsibilities in the administration of FIELD WORK, S.A. Moffett and J.E. Adams, editors, pp.152, 153.*

photo-copy in the Samuel Hugh Moffett collection of Samuel Austin Moffett papers. Original in the collections of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)